

**ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL HAZARDOUS WASTE PUBLIC
CONSULTATION MEETING: TRANSCRIPT**

SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK

FEBRUARY 10, 1986

**New Brunswick
Environmental
Council: 1986**

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

MR. J. BEDELL	43, 44, 48
MR. K. CORBETT	67
MS. S. GODIN	18, 21, 23, 25, 49, 50, 64, 65
MR. G. HILL	26
MR. JORDAN	28, 29
MR. D. KERR	53
REV. L. LAKE	22, 23, 25, 46, 67
MR. K. LANGMAID	10, 19, 20, 32, 35, 58, 59, 63, 64
MR. L. LAPIERRE	1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 56, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67
MRS. B. LEBLANC	38, 41, 42
MR. G. LITTLE	4, 9, 10, 11, 20, 48, 50
MR. R. LUTES	15, 16, 17, 31, 32, 39, 41, 42, 43, 51, 52, 57, 58, 59
MR. B. MACLEAN	51, 52
MRS. S. MITCHELL	29
MR. L. MURPHY	12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 61, 62, 63
MR. R. QUON	44
MR. C. ROBICHAUD	11, 12, 56
DR. L. M. SIMON	25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 65
MRS. H. TAYLOR	10, 62, 63, 65
MR. D. THOMPSON	54, 58, 60
DR. P. TIPPETT	32
MR. B. WILSON	34



LAPIERRE:

Ok, I guess we're ready to begin this evening's session. I'd like to welcome you all to the first meeting of the public consultation program concerning hazardous waste in New Brunswick and all related aspects of waste management planning for the Province.

My name is Louis LaPierre. I'm a professor of biology at the University of Moncton and also Chairman of the New Brunswick Environmental Council. I will be presiding as Chairman of tonight's meeting and before going any further I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the other members of the Environmental Council sub-committee on waste management.

To my far right is Mr. Ken Langmaid. Ken Langmaid is a soil scientist who now resides in the coastal town of St. Andrews. Next, to my right is Mrs. Helen Taylor. Helen is a businesswoman from Doaktown. On my immediate left is Mr. Donald Smith from Belledune. On my far right, Mr. Dave Kerr from Edmundston. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Kerr are professional engineers.

As you know, we are all members of the Environmental Council. I understand there is additional biographical information on the panel members at the reception area on the side of the room here if you wish to have further details on the Council members.

The purpose of tonight's meeting and for each of the six other meetings in the series is to provide an informal forum and I'd like to underline an informal forum for all New Brunswickers to voice their comments and opinions on the subjects of hazardous waste and related waste management issues in New Brunswick. As you all know, waste management is a product of the twentieth century. We can't hide from it. We can't get away from it. We have to attack it and we have to manage it. We in the twentieth century have gone on to great ventures. We have conquered space, we've travelled through space, but we have difficulty in small elements in our society, and that's waste disposal. The implorable waste disposal problem is a sincere problem and it's a problem that we as individuals have to come to grips with and try to find some sound management program.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment has asked the Environmental Council to consult with the public on his behalf regarding this important and highly complex issue. At the conclusion of the meetings in mid-March, the Council will be asked to present a report to the Minister which will include our recommendations concerning the future development of waste management policies and programs in the Province.

I should note that we are hoping to complete our report by early May. It will be released publicly together with verbatim transcripts of the seven individual meetings.

In order to assist in the production of the meeting transcripts, tonight's discussion is being tape-recorded and simultaneous translation service is available for any of you who may wish it. In the back of the room you can pick up translation devices if you so need them. They are available at the desk.

There is no requirement for the presentation of written briefs. However if you have any extra copies of your presentation, please speak to one of the staff people present tonight. We would appreciate having a copy of it, but don't be offended if you don't have any, we have no requirements for written briefs. You can tell who these individuals are who could collect your briefs, they have written name tags and they are in different locations around the hall.

Following each presentation or statement, the members of the panel may wish to ask questions of clarification and I would ask the presentors if they could entertain questions from the audience also. When you approach to make a presentation, or if you approach to ask a question, I would ask you to identify yourself and approach one of the microphones that have been identified on the floor. This is necessary for the proper identification in the transcripts.

Despite the microphones that you see around the room, we hope that the discussions will be kept at a very informal level. We would not want to get technical. I know that my colleagues and I are very interested in discussing each and every aspect of the subject area and I would encourage everyone here this evening, including the news media, to participate if they have a question to raise. You may participate in either English or French and as I mentioned before there are earphones available at the back.

As was indicated in the Minister's press release of January 14th a package of background information has been prepared and distributed widely by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment to assist members of the public in becoming familiar with the subject matter that we are here to discuss. Extra copies of this package and other background materials are available at the entrance.

I wish to make just a few short comments on waste disposal. I guess no one in New Brunswick is unaware of hazardous waste or waste disposal problems in general. We in New Brunswick are no different from any other Province in Canada in that we generate waste, we generate close to, according to the inventory we have, 1,800 tons of waste annually. Some of this waste is highly toxic. Some of it isn't.

However, regardless of whether it is highly toxic or not, we still have to dispose of it. Up until now we have had disposal methods that were not always what they should have been and in certain areas of the Province we're seeing the results of what happens when uncontrolled waste is let loose in the environment.

Modern societies have many conveniences but conveniences of modern society do produce waste and the waste disposal problems I mentioned before are a collective responsibility of modern society and we can't shun this responsibility. It doesn't help to say responsibility of waste disposal belongs to industry. Industry rarely produces a waste for the sake of producing waste. Industry produces waste because society in general often times uses the products that come about from waste disposal. So in that sense I guess we all have a role to play in the elimination of waste.

Disposal of waste, whether it be toxic or general waste, is expensive. I was reading a report of the Economic Council of Canada today where they predict that 2% of the world's domestic product will be directly affected to waste disposal in the coming years. Some will argue that these dollars could be better spent in generating economy. Well, waste disposal does generate economy. Maybe not always the ah...we're not always open to the revenues of waste disposal but in areas where waste disposal has been undertaken in a controlled manner, jobs have been developed from waste control. So I think we mustn't always look towards waste disposal as a net cost.

Also we must consider in the cost of waste disposal the clean-up that follows where areas become polluted. We are presently aware of what is happening in the Industrial belt of Ontario, we see what's happened to the St. Lawrence River and we're also seeing what happens to local communities in New Brunswick when you lose certain amenities such as water, you only know how important it is once you've lost it. And as we know, once the groundwater table is polluted, it can be many years before it's cleaned up.

So I think with that in mind I would now ask first of all if there are certain people who have indicated they would like to present a formal brief to the meetings, and then we would entertain questions. I would now ask Mr. Little who has indicated that he wanted to present a brief, if he could please come up to the podium and present his brief.

LITTLE:

I'm George Little, Leader of the New Democratic Party in New Brunswick. I make this presentation on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

I'd like to, first of all, wish the Task Force well in their deliberations around the Province. They're doing some very important work and I hope that they will make sure that the voices of the people of this Province are heard when it comes to formulating government policy in this very vital area of provincial life.

I'd like to begin, perhaps, just by clarifying the problem. Throwing things away has become very much a part of our way of life. We'd like to think for a minute, assuming you were living in a house which was completely self-contained, you had nowhere outside the house to put your waste, to put your garbage. Only inside the house. How quickly all the things that we threw away would build up in the spare room, in the hall, in the kitchen, in the bathroom. How long would it be, however much we tried to compact or control all that waste, how long would it be before...there would just be Corn Flakes packets, junked old batteries, pieces of electronic junk that we throw away. How long would it be before that would so stifle the environment inside that house that your dog would get sick, and your children would get sick and you would get sick.

Well, in a microcosm, in fact that's what the earth is. The earth in which we live ever since they took those first pictures of the earth from up in space which showed the earth not as some vast area that we inhabit but in fact as a tiny fragile space ship. A self-contained ecological system is what we live in. There is no "away." We talk about throwing things away and we realize that we in fact live in a space ship, there is no away to throw things to. That's for lack of any method of transporting it out into space and no doubt that will be our next effort to try and pollute space next.

Because out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean people like Jacques Cousteau have found floating garbage, in the most remote parts of the world people have turned up and found crushed beer cans. There is no away. And I think that perhaps is one of the lessons that we still need to learn.

You're reporting that 1,900 tons of hazardous waste that New Brunswick has. I think that's a part of about 50,000 tons of waste of all kinds that we have to get rid of in this Province in a year. See nature's way of disposing of waste is easy. Because nature is patient. Nature is not in a hurry. Nature's biosystem will recycle almost anything given time. And nature has time. Nature can wait for the 50 years or so that it takes a toxic chemical to break down and be consumed into the ecosystem. Nature can even wait the quarter of a million years it might take for nuclear wastes to lose their lethal radioactivity. So nature's way is easy. Just wait. Wait a quarter of a million years or half a million years. No matter what we do now, it'll be OK. Nature will clean it up.

But man can't afford to be that patient. Societies can't afford to be that patient. Because it doesn't really matter to nature how long each individual has to play a part in the ecosystem, either alive or dead. It doesn't really matter to nature. But it does matter to us human beings. We're responsible for protecting our environment through good management, but it has been our experience, I would submit, that good management will be achieved only through sound regulation and legislation. The responsibility exists even when we do have regulation. It's irresponsible, I would submit, to continue to build up hazardous waste, nuclear waste for instance, without making a supreme effort to find safe ways to dispose of them. And we haven't yet done that.

And when we have a government which has done so little to arrange for the disposal of the radioactive wastes from the nuclear power plant it would seem that they would have very little leverage when it comes to arguing against an undesirable site threatened across the border in Maine which is what we're threatened with now. A government which has not really kept its own house in order as far as permanent ways of getting rid of nuclear wastes would seem to me would have very little leverage in persuading the United States government not to have a waste site on our doorstep in Maine. Even though that site may endanger very important New Brunswick water systems.

Without a disposal system we can be lulled also into a false sense of the cost of such nuclear power. It would seem to me that one of the things that this Task Force might consider is the cost of disposing of all kinds of hazardous waste, nuclear waste among them, so we might get a realistic view of how much nuclear power costs us. Because if we build in the factor of how we get rid of the materials, how we get rid of the radioactive waste, then it alters the whole picture of the cost of nuclear power.

I would like to consider particularly in this brief something that has been very much in my interest over the last few weeks. Particularly the problem of contamination of groundwater by pollutants because these pollutants have not been safely disposed of. This kind of contamination, the contamination of groundwater, is of significant concern to New Brunswickers because groundwater is the source of drinking water for two thirds of the families and communities in New Brunswick.

That includes such urban centers as Fredericton. And over the years the problems with the contamination of groundwater have plagued a number of New Brunswick communities, such as Hillsborough where benzene contamination affected the community water supply, and prior to this most recent incident involving perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene) Fairvale itself, the village of Fairvale, experienced petroleum contamination of their water supply for a number of families.

The Department of the Environment is well aware of the increasing concern and number of incidents of contamination of groundwater. The annual report of the Department of the Environment for the year 1982-1983 cited 294 complaints involving drinking water and water supplies. In their most recent report for the period 1984-1985, the number of complaints had risen to 493.

Petroleum and benzene contamination continues to be a serious problem despite the public attention this issue has received in the last few years. In the Department's report for 1984-1985 there were 61 reported cases of petroleum contamination involving 80 water supplies.

With regard to this current issue of perchloroethylene contamination, the Department of the Environment cannot claim to be unaware of the hazards associated with this chemical entering the water supply. It's become a very public issue last spring as a result of the CBC program which reported perchloroethylene contamination of well water in Fredericton. The response from the Department was then less than acceptable. Instead of taking immediate action to ban the disposal of perchloroethylene in landfill sites or the sewer system, the Minister refused in the Legislation to take the action needed to control a chemical that is a carcinogen and prevent its entry into the groundwater supplies. All it appears that the Department did do was to send around to dry cleaning firms in the Province a hand out from Dow Chemical on reducing perchloroethylene output. There are no guidelines for the disposal and we're still waiting to see what action the Department will take in that regard.

Now we note that the owner of the Dry Cleaning firm that is suspected of being the source of contamination in Fairvale has stated that his firm had not broken any government regulation in their treatment of perchloroethylene. There weren't hardly any regulations to be broken. I would stress that there must be immediate action to deal with what is developing into a crisis of the drinking water supply of our Province and the delay by the Department of the Environment and the lack of concern on the part of the government of New Brunswick cannot and must not continue.

Consequently, I would recommend among other measures that must be taken, the following:

- there must be a complete ban on the disposal of perchloroethylene and other toxic liquid wastes by dumping in landfill sites or sewer systems.
- The Department must immediately establish guidelines that will prohibit allowing such liquid wastes to enter groundwater through dumping. The only safe method for the disposal of perchloroethylene is by incineration.

- Provision for the collection and transport of this substance must be made and there should be automatic and strict penalties established for violators.
- The Province, in the coming session of the Legislature, should enact a Safe Drinking Water Act that will protect the quality of drinking water for New Brunswickers and their communities. I believe that action is being taken in the United States at the moment under the Environmental Protection agency to improve their drinking water standards so that no level of a known carcinogen would be acceptable in drinking water. We've had levels of 10ppb, 3ppb and in the United States they are moving to eliminate all traceable carcinogens from water supplies.
- There should also be monitoring for priority pollutants. We know that there are certain pollutants which commonly get into the drinking supply and perchloroethylene is one of them. There should be constant monitoring of municipal water supplies for purity from these known pollutants.
- The government of New Brunswick hasn't got a very good record of success in environmental prosecution. Successful prosecution requires expertise that is developed through specialization. At the moment, I believe, what happens is if there's a case to be prosecuted, the Department of the Environment simply sends the matter over to the Department of Justice and prosecution proceeds from there. In other jurisdictions in Canada and in the United States, environmental agencies have their own legal people. So that when an environmental issue comes before the courts it is presented by a lawyer who is an expert in environmental matters. All we have at the moment is if a question of the environment comes up and it comes to the courts, we have perhaps a major company with a battery of lawyers well briefed in environmental issues from the company's side and the government doing the prosecuting being represented by a lawyer from the Justice department who may not have much in the way of expertise. The Department of the Environment should hire on staff a lawyer whose function it would be to prosecute violations of environmental legislation and also act as a resource for the Department in examining legislative initiatives in other jurisdictions on environmental matters.

- One of the things that government should undertake is an extensive groundwater survey. In other jurisdictions it has been suggested that you take 50 wells around a landfill site and do testing of these 50 wells and then 50 wells at random chosen in an area outside the borders of the landfill site in a given region and you have some sort of control, some comparison between the wells around the landfill site and the wells randomly chosen elsewhere in the district.
- I would also like to suggest the establishment of a provincial Waste Management Corporation. I think the time has passed when we can allow our waste management to be such a haphazard thing as it's been in the past. A provincially, even a regionally established Waste Management Corporation with its own incinerator to get rid of these hazardous wastes in the only safe way that we know would go a long way, I think, to helping us get control of what is becoming a massive problem for us.

In conclusion then I would just like to say that I think we have been far too haphazard in our approach to what must truly be one of the major problems facing a modern, technological society ...it's waste management. If you want to know how much waste we produce have a look at the garbage can over there. See how much waste we've produced tonight by having a cup of coffee. Cups and plastic from little capsules of milk, bags from sugar, and that's just from the number of people in this room. Multiply that by the number of times it takes to get the people in New Brunswick and see how much...that is a real problem for us in a society where we want to throw so much away and there just isn't any "away."

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Little. I wonder if you may stay there for a minute if we have a few questions. I don't know if anyone from the floor has any questions for Mr. Little. If not, Mr. Little I'd like to ask... How would you propose that these things be funded? You're talking about Waste Management Corporations and a few other recommendations that you have.

LITTLE:

The Waste Management Corporation could be self-funding, could be self supporting.

LAPIERRE:

And the regional concept of your waste management corporation, how you see that? Would it be a regional board or a group of people...

LITTLE:

These details could be worked out but I would see it as you have in any other sort of cooperative venture from the Maritime Provinces, for instance. I think you could well have that operated there. It would be self-supporting also.

TAYLOR:

Could you elaborate on the self-supporting...financially how would that be possible? Or what your ideas are?

LITTLE:

Well at the moment businesses pay to get rid of their wastes in landfill sites and they would also pay to have it disposed of in these waste disposal centers.

LANGMAID:

Would you expect to have an incinerator to burn all these toxic wastes at each landfill site or each regional one?

LITTLE:

I'm not sure that would be necessary but I think....

LANGMAID:

I'm thinking of the costs, the costs would be terrific.

LITTLE:

I think that you would have to have a cost-effectiveness study and see how much waste you're going to have at each of these sites and then build accordingly.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Little, there's a sentiment out in society which is not-in-my-backyard sort of system, the NIMBY syndrome...it's great to dispose of wastes, now if you're talking of these Waste Management Corporations eventually what you're looking at is waste disposal in someone's backyard. How do you think society would react to that?

LITTLE:

Well for one thing I think I didn't mention in my brief but implicit in it was the notion that we have far too much waste. I think that if governments had spent as much money in developing recycling procedures for all kinds of waste that we presently just throw away, then the problem would be much smaller than it is so one of the things implicit in what I was saying is that perhaps we should be looking at ways of recycling much of our waste. And that in itself would cut down in the notion of not-in-my-backyard. I think we could make it a much more handleable issue. I think it's a matter of public education.

LAPIERRE:

Well I guess for the moment we thank you Mr. Little and we'll pass onto someone else. Is Mr. Robichaud in the audience? I wonder at this time if Mr. Robichaud who is from the city of Saint John I understand, if you may tell us how people in Saint John dispose of toxic waste. Can anybody go to the landfill site with hazardous waste?

ROBICHAUD:

No, if they attempt to come to our landfill site with hazardous waste we direct them to the Province of New Brunswick. As far as the city of Saint John is concerned the Province of New Brunswick has taken on this problem and we see it as their problem.

LAPIERRE:

So that means that you have a constant monitoring of what goes into your landfill?

ROBICHAUD:

I expect that there are small containers of hazardous waste going into the landfill site. We don't go through garbage bags and stuff like that, so I expect that if you look very closely you'll find hazardous waste going into our landfill site. Large containers or anything that we know about is definitely directed to the Province. We won't allow them in the landfill site, if we know they are attempting to go in.

LAPIERRE:

Can any citizen go to the landfill site or is it just contractors?

ROBICHAUD:

No, everybody can go the landfill site, anybody at all.

LAPIERRE:

So then anybody could cart off his pesticides or his oil into the landfill site.

ROBICHAUD:

That is correct.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Are there any other individuals who would like to make a presentation at this time. Mr. Murphy...do you want to take the microphone please, Mr. Murphy?

MURPHY:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Lou Murphy and I'm MLA for Saint John Harbour and it's not my intention this evening to make a presentation but I have, since your Committee sat this evening, made a few notes and I would like to comment from those.

I think, first of all, that this is a wonderful thing for a Task Force to be formed, to come out and inform the people, not only to inform them, but rather to get the views of the people. The people appreciate it when a Task Force comes to them asking their opinions and their views on these different matters and your Committee certainly is no exception.

You mentioned when you opened your remarks about hazardous waste and we know that there has been a lot of objection to hazardous waste being stored in the northern part of the Province, when the Miramichi people and I would say that in connection with that under no circumstances should hazardous waste be stored permanently in New Brunswick. About two hazardous waste holding areas should be built in New Brunswick but these would be only temporary, to hold the hazardous waste on a temporary basis and then that it would be shipped out of the Province. I understand that the Province of Quebec is quite willing to accept hazardous waste and that they have the necessary furnace that can destroy this waste at a very, very high temperature and I feel that that's what should be done. I don't think they should ever be stored permanently in the Province of New Brunswick.

I think that one of the reasons that the government ran into such opposition about hazardous waste being stored in the bunkers was due to the fact that the people are suspicious. They feel that once it is put there it'll be forgotten, it'll be there for time to eternity. And that's what the people are..it's fear on the part of the people.

But there is no doubt about it that there should be storage bins, at least a couple of them, where the hazardous waste for all parts of the Province must be taken until it can be shipped out to Quebec or whatever other areas willing to purchase it.

About two years ago the Province had a study made, the Province and federal government had a study made with regard to the possible hazardous waste that was dumped out at the French Village dump. Now, unfortunately that study was supposed to take one year. Already two years have gone by and the report has not been released yet. It is my firm opinion that the Department of the Environment has that information at their finger tips and that they are dragging their feet in releasing it.

Now the people are entitled to that. They were told that it would be released and two years is too long for any study to take and I can't see why it would take that. I would be willing to bet that the Department of the Environment has that report as of this very minute and they are dragging their feet in not releasing it.

One thing that I was very much interested in all the recommendations Mr. Little mentioned and it's not my intention to repeat them. I do think that some education should be given to the people about curtailing the creation of waste. You know it's very, very few of the people who has any idea of what the various kinds of waste are. And that's why there aren't far more written presentations made to you this evening. Because people aren't familiar enough with this subject and unless it affects them directly they are inclined to say, oh it'll disappear or go away. But it won't go away and another thing is, when we speak of the environment, some people think of the environment as just a dump in one section of the city or so forth, but that's not so. Environment includes everything around you. It includes the grass, the trees, the birds and everything that you can possibly think of as the environment. It's not only a dump in some particular location.

And about the hazardous waste what you say...where are we going to locate these country holding areas? The government has lots of Crown land on which they could locate those. There is no shortage of land. My heavens above, land in the Province of New Brunswick that is not developed is tremendous and the government is the biggest holder of all and that's where that land should be made available by the government itself. So that it's not in someone's backyard. You can't expect people to want the likes of that place there.

And about clearing up the problem of hazardous waste, you say it would be very expensive. Expensive it is, there's no question about it. But if it's a matter of health, they can't put a price tag on health and that can be far more expensive because as you and I know the money that is spent, the biggest part of your tax dollar or my tax dollar goes for health and education. Those are the two big expenditures that any government has to make. So I just offer these few comments, Doctor, to you and your committee.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy. I wonder if you won't mind staying there. I'd like to ask Mr. Lutes in regard to Mr. Murphy's comment regarding the French Village dump study. I wonder if Mr. Lutes would have a comment regarding the status of... I'd first like to mention that we have a few individuals from the Department of the Environment who are here and willing to answer questions so I'm asking this question but if members here this evening have questions you're welcome to ask them also. Mr. Lutes.

LUTES:

I'd like to clarify a point with regard to the abandoned site study. We've had a number of calls in the last month or so from media and the area and from concerned residents and basically as Mr. Murphy has pointed out it was supposed to be a one-year study and I think the study started in March of 1984 and it's getting into two years. The problem that we had, we had two problems I guess basically. Number one when we drilled the holes I don't want to get into a lot of technical details but basically when we drilled the holes at the French Village site and at the Howes Lake site the drill water that we used stayed in the holes and if we sampled at that point in time we would be sampling basically the same uncontaminated water that we put into the holes. The problem that we had was allowing it, we could either pump it out or allow it to drain out on its own. And we felt, the study was costing \$150,000 and there wasn't really a whole lot of point in sampling the water, the uncontaminated water we put into the holes in the first place so...it was agreed that we would wait six to eight months until that water purged itself out through and we got samples of the leachate, the actual normal groundwater flow through the landfill site. We have done that.

The other problem that we have is the consultant who is doing this work is also the same consultant who is doing the controlled waste study for us. And it happens to be the same individual, the same hydrogeologist who is involved in both studies. With the controlled waste study we had to get the drilling done in the late fall of this year or we would lose essentially the six months over the winter. But we got that done but it meant putting the write-up of the abandoned site study on hold for a period of two or three months.

So we lost some time, we lost six or eight months. Obviously, I guess we could have sampled at that point but I think it would have been a waste of the taxpayers' money to get essentially zero contaminants in the samples. Plus the fact that the same consultant was involved in both studies and we do not have those results. I talked to the consultant today as a matter of fact, I call him about every second day and he has assured us that by Wednesday of this week, we'll have a draft report.

MURPHY:

Well Mr. Lutes there is strange information being given from your office. I know that the media has been told at least a week ago that they had received it that very day and now you're telling me you haven't got it. Which is right?

LUTES:

We haven't got it that's the truth. I talked to someone on Friday, I think it was some member of the media. I got the same story from them, that the information was available or had been released and that is certainly not the case.

MURPHY:

Why would the information come out of the same office, two different stories?

LUTES:

I don't know where the other information came from. I honestly don't know if, you know there's.....

MURPHY:

When, Mr. Chairman, when, Mr. Lutes, would you expect that report will be released to the public? Because after all it's being paid by public funds therefore they have a right to the information it contains.

LUTES:

Certainly. As I mentioned we should have a draft report by Wednesday. Now that's...there's about a dozen deadlines that have passed and we just put the wood to the consultant that we want it this week. That will be a draft report and if there's no serious problem with the way it's written up, we should get a final report by the end of the month.

MURPHY:

By the end of February it should be released to the public eh?

LUTES:

I would think so yes.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Lutes. Mr. Murphy, do you have another question?

MURPHY:

No.

LAPIERRE:

Ok. I have one more question, maybe to Miss Godin who is also from the Department of the Environment. One of the comments by Mr. Murphy was that people aren't always aware of the polluting aspects in the environment. In looking through your data of compiled chemicals that are produced in the Province, I see that the photographic industry has a certain amount of chemicals. Could you elaborate on these chemicals? How they are being disposed of? What happens to these because photography stores are all over the countryside. We see these one-hour quick developing places. What happens to these chemicals?

GODIN:

The majority of the photographic chemicals are highly diluted solutions, aqueous solutions, and they are mostly disposed of through sewers except for some recycling of precious metals. The exact nature of the photochemicals is not really well known to me. I have not had the time to look into that particular area sufficiently to be able to comment on it. All I can say is that the volumes are misleading because of the great dilution factor involved and another thing is that there is some recycling involved in precious metals from the photochemical solutions and that the bulk of the volume is being sewered.

LAPIERRE:

By the metals, you mean silver is recuperated.

GODIN:

Yes.

MURPHY:

I would like to say to the lady that there is an urgency and if she isn't familiar with it now, she should concentrate on it because this is something that can't be delayed.

GODIN:

I try to concentrate as much on all the problems that we have to deal with. As you know hazardous wastes range from photographic chemicals to PCB, perchloroethylene and everything in between. Unfortunately with the staff and the resources that we have we can only deal with so many problems at one time. It's not good protection of the environment but we do the best we can with the resources we have at hand.

MURPHY:

I can agree with the lady and I would point out that reading about the environment is not like reading a romance story, there's a vast difference. You won't enjoy it nearly as much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Miss Godin. I would like to ask Mr. Murphy another question. Mr Murphy, you indicated that for the storage of chemicals in New Brunswick, we should gather our chemicals in specific areas and then transport them out of the Province. I wonder what are your views on the transportation of hazardous chemicals? Should any chemical which travels on our roadway be known to someone? Should we have a registration process by which trucks are registered and a manifest system, in order that if an accident happens, for example, we know exactly what's in the cargo? And would you see these to be different than in cities for example? Would the cities such as Saint John, for example, consider specific by-laws for transportation of chemicals within the city such as truck routes where these chemicals can go? What are your.....

MURPHY:

I think Mr. Chairman that you will agree with me that the federal government is not leaving it up to the individual areas. The federal government is laying down very, very strict guidelines and I think some of those guidelines could be in mail as of now and one of the things is that everything should be clearly marked so that you know exactly when a truck is going by what it contains and so forth and the federal government is laying down very, very strict regulations and it will be far more strict than if it was left up to the individual communities to lay down the regulations. They wouldn't be nearly as effective. Because they would vary from one city to another to one town to one village and so forth. But with the federal government laying them down and the provincial government enforcing them then we should get some good protection in that regard.

LAPIERRE:

Any comments from the panel? Questions? Ken?

LANGHAID:

What do you think of having specific truck routes for hazardous wastes, and what about the railroads? Should that be handled the same way, at specific hours, at specific times the hazardous materials should be transported?

MURPHY:

I think that's an exceptionally good idea to have specific routes that this waste would be transported because by doing that they can be monitored more easily than if a truck and so forth can take any route at all. Certainly, your railways will have to be very strict too in how they handle this waste because as you know we've had some not so pleasant experiences in the not too distant past.

LANGHAID:

This would also be not only hazardous waste but hazardous materials, I would think too.

MURPHY:

Exactly, exactly, you're quite correct in that.

LAPIERRE:

Does any one else have any questions? Yes Mr. Little.

LITTLE:

I wonder if the Department of the Environment can assure us that they're doing their best to make sure that they have a proper inventory of hazardous waste. I note in the 1983 inventory of the Department of the Environment there was an ironic note there that the dry cleaning industry reports no hazardous wastes. I wonder, that's obviously a gross inaccuracy since the dry cleaning industry uses all kinds of hazardous materials. I wonder if the Department of the Environment could ensure us that they will in fact take this very basic step of having an inventory of what exactly there is to throw away. There is no "away" in our Province.

LAPIERRE:

I wonder if one of the two individuals might care to answer that and at the same time you might care to comment on Mr. Murphy's comments before which were guidelines for storage and disposal of perchloroethylene in the Province for example.

GODIN:

To deal with the broader issue of the inventory...always when you do hazardous waste inventory the basic problem with having an accurate inventory and an inventory that will repeat itself is to have a very accurate definition of what is a hazardous waste and what is not a hazardous waste.

In the case of perchloroethylene, when the original inventory was done, industries were approached and asked what kind of chemicals they used, what kind of waste they produced and what they did with the waste and in the dry cleaning industry as more people I think are becoming more and more familiar there is a recycling of the waste.

In 1982 not knowing more about dry cleaning, recycling of the waste was felt to be the adequate treatment of the waste and the assumption was made that there was no hazardous waste produced by dry cleaning establishments. What we have found out since is that the recycling of perchloroethylene varies very much from establishment to establishment. Some establishments do an extraordinarily good job of recycling so that the waste that has to be disposed of only contains a very small percentage of perchloroethylene.

If managers of dry cleaning facilities do it right, they can get the perchloroethylene concentrations to lower than 2%. We had found perchloroethylene at 30% in some areas in New Brunswick. We had tried to push for better recycling methods in the dry cleaning establishments over the last year.

As far as guidelines to be developed specifically for the dry cleaning industry, yes I think we have realized that the only way to have a good handle on what is being done is to address that specific sector of hazardous waste generators, if you wish. And we are in the process of looking at not only developing guidelines, because developing guidelines is easy enough to do..you write them on paper and you send them out. What we need is to develop guidelines that we can enforce with the staff that we have and with the money that we have and to either analyse wastes that are produced or to keep track of what is happening to the wastes. So we need to have a total package together and that's what we're working on now; developing guidelines with the methods to enforce the guidelines so that they are not just on paper but that they are effective.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Miss Godin. Mr. Murphy, just one more question, I don't know if you have a comment but I have one more question I'd like to address to you. You mention that one of the major avenues of waste disposal or toxic waste would be to send it to Ontario or Quebec where they have the proper facilities for disposal.

What are your comments if the Province of Quebec or Ontario closes its borders to the transportation of waste? It's a hypothetical question but what do you then see for our hazardous waste?

MURPHY:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should deal with the realities at the present time. There is an area in Ontario and also Quebec that are willing to accept hazardous wastes, therefore yours is a hypothetical question and I think we should deal in realities. You know, I do appreciate what you're saying, but let's just take it as it is of now.

LAKE:

I'm Lloyd Lake, 1018 Manawagonish Road, Saint John. I just wanted to ask Mr. Murphy following his splendid presentation a question with reference to retaining and controlling the hazardous waste. He has intimated that the Crown land would be an excellent place. It seems to me that it's very appropriate but it would be a place that would be designed for that purpose, protected from the public, the public's approach and also inspected regularly. Now my question is with reference to the containers. The containers in which the waste would be put would be carefully lined and the life of these containers would have to be very carefully estimated and checked from time to time. The containers...do you have any thought on what containers they would be?

MURPHY:

Well, I think that they should be a metal container, that this stuff would be put in. I mean, you couldn't put it in any flimsy affair, it has to be put into something and then be sealed, properly sealed because you're dealing with something that's very, very dangerous and I think that you have summed it up very, very well the way that you have expressed this.

LAKE:

Yes, then there would have to be retaining walls of some description around where you were placing it. And these could be raised as an elevator sort of thing so that they could be carefully inspected all around.

MURPHY:

That would be necessary....

LAKE:

All four sides.

MURPHY:

Yes, that would be necessary, Reverend. Very necessary.

LAKE:

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

I guess at this time I would like to thank Mr. Murphy. I think you have been up long enough, you can get up at any time. I wouldn't want to make you stay there any more. I think at this time it might be appropriate to ask Mr. Lutes or Miss Godin, whichever one wants to address the topic of maybe giving us a short description of what the Province has in mind for a follow-up to Mr. Murphy's request for storage of hazardous waste or controlled waste in the Province. We heard Mr. Murphy's presentation on provincial lands, for example. Could you give us a short summary of what we're looking at as a provincial option?

GODIN:

Obviously, the question of a transfer station or a temporary storage area is the logical next step in hazardous waste management. Setting up a storage facility is extremely complicated both because of the present perception and fear of anything to do with hazardous waste when it comes to siting and in the operation of a transfer station who puts up the capital costs to set up the transfer station? Who takes the responsibility? Some Provinces already have transfer stations in existence.

Québec has transfer stations. Ontario has transfer stations. Nova Scotia had a warehouse that was serving the purpose of a transfer station and in the last year the people that were managing that transfer station went out of business and the Province of Nova Scotia was stuck with a warehouse full of hazardous waste. So there are pitfalls.

Setting up a transfer station is something that you have to look at extremely carefully. Siting on Crown land also seems the most logical approach and in the work that we've done in the past year on controlled waste sites, we have looked at Crown land because of just that...the added security that you get because of distance. The buffer zone that you can have where you will not have in habitations, you will not have any private homes going up near the area and there are numerous advantages to Crown land. We are finding out that the soils in Crown lands are not always suitable for the purpose of landfilling and the transfer station you would also have to be careful on the type of land that you would site it on as a secondary containment.

The gentleman who addressed the problem of having secure storage in as far as containers and dykes and protection to prevent any spillage from the storage area was right. It's the only way to set up a safe storage facility. But, the storage facility, I see as a natural extension of a hazardous waste management. I don't know if it should be a provincial responsibility to set up a transfer station or if the transfer station should come as a natural extension of the hazardous waste management in place in the Province where the generators because of the greater demand from carriers and receivers of hazardous waste would see the advantage of setting up a transfer station on an economic scale and develop the transfer station with the need being present at that time, as opposed to developing a transfer station before having a market or an active market for a transfer station.

LAPIERRE:

Yes there's a question in the back and I'll come back to the Reverend in a minute. Yes sir?

SIMON:

Just for clarification after all of that I'm trying to piece together the answer to the question is the Department of the Environment doing anything? And I seem to say here that it's doing nothing. It's considering a lot of options, but that the Department of the Environment at this time has no plans for any specific action.

LAPIERRE:

Madame Godin, do you have an answer?

GODIN:

It is my understanding that there has been a request for funds to have a study made in the Province of New Brunswick for establishing one or more transfer stations, the feasibility study of how that should be done, when it should be done and by whom. I get a little lost when it comes to the financial workings of the Department so I can't tell you who, Bob maybe you can help me out on this one.....

LAPIERRE:

I guess just one comment here. This is a process that the Task Force is going to have to address. And I guess one of the reasons the Task Force is here is that the Provincial Government sees that it has to do something and we're supposed to, at the end of our hearings, present some recommendations, so any ideas that you have would be welcome because these are things, exactly as mentioned, we need help on that aspect and there are I guess no specific plans at the present time. Sir?

LAKE:

I've already identified myself. With reference to the expenses, it seems to me that the hazardous waste in the Province of New Brunswick is an extension of the production of nuclear power and other items in the Province. It really belongs to us. And therefore the disposal of the same is our responsibility.

Now the Ministers of the various Provinces in the future may come together and lobby with the Dominion government or the Federal government and arrange to have substance grants or something of that nature towards the cost but I would think it naturally follows that it is our responsibility to see that it's justly extended to containers and this sort of thing and our own plan should be set for the disposal of these hazardous wastes.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Mr. Hill.

HILL:

My name is Gerry Hill. I'm the Information Officer for the Department. The gentleman, I'm sorry I've forgotten his name, asked the question about what the Department's plans are and I just had an opportunity to give him a copy of the Status Report document which is over on the table there and which was released in the early part of January and if I may just try to respond to his question. In the Status Report which is 25 pages or so, which was produced by the Department, I guess the attempt there was to outline the options that face the Province today in 1986 in terms of moving towards the establishment of a hazardous waste management system for the Province.

It doesn't pretend to be a detailed technical document that covers every possible point but I think that if you have a chance to read it and as people have a chance to discuss it over the next several weeks as this public meeting series goes on, it represents the cumulative view of the Department as to the kind of direction that New Brunswick should take in the years ahead in the development of a comprehensive waste management strategy. There is inventory data based on inventory material that was developed last summer there. There is a suggestion as to how the Province would approach the management of hazardous wastes, the development of a system which would see the toxic materials shipped to the disposal facilities such as the one that's proposed in Québec in 1988 for high-temperature incineration and so on.

No one is pretending that document is a detailed, last minute, concrete action plan, but in a sense the fact that we're trying to get people involved in the discussion now at a stage where the department's plans are still in a fluid state I think is positive rather than negative.

The experience in other Provinces in Canada suggests that if governments move down to the final moment on the planning of hazardous waste management to the point where all the decisions have been made before giving the public an opportunity to ask questions, offer alternative suggestions or what have you, that kind of approach has not worked in other Provinces in Canada. I guess our approach has been to say right, we have a certain body of information now.

We have a certain general direction that's been proposed and we want to give the citizens of New Brunswick an opportunity to ask questions about that, to make suggestions, there have been many suggestions put forward this evening already and that's the process that we're going to be going through over the next four weeks or so. To try to give people an opportunity to input at what is admittedly a very early stage, a very conceptual stage as far as planning waste management as far as the Province is concerned.

Some of you may be aware that the Province's Environmental Impact Assessment program is in place which would require full and detailed Environmental Impact studies on any kind of facilities that were proposed by government in this regard. The need for those environmental studies, the need for public consultation that's inherent in that requirement suggests that we're still a couple of years away before ultimate decisions are made but the concept as I understand it anyway that the Minister had in mind in asking the Environmental Council in holding these meetings at this stage will be to give citizens an opportunity to ask precisely the questions that the gentleman asked now before concrete, final decisions are made at a time when the planning is still fluid so that people can have a chance to participate in that planning process.

There's all kinds of copies of the Status Report over on the desk as well as other materials that we've prepared to try to assist people in becoming familiar with the issue and it will be probably some time before the last T is crossed and the last I is dotted on the plan but the concept is to try and give people a chance to input at a stage before that plan is set in concrete.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Hill. I'd like to ask if Mr. Murphy would like to speak again, but I'd like to ask if there are any other groups or persons who would like at this time to present something. Yes, sir and the lady....go ahead sir.

JORDAN:

I didn't come here to make a speech because I didn't bring my shovel with me for what I've heard so far.

LAPIERRE:

Could you introduce yourself please?

JORDAN:

I live in Fairvale, which is very sad indeed. I've had two people come to see if it was worth listing my house and one was Mr. Swanton, a young man in real estate. He said, "Jordan, I couldn't give your house away." I've sent my water into the to (tape inaudible) have it for bacteria and there's bacteria in it so it's going on through to Montreal because I called the lady and she said it would be three months before we could do anything for you sir in Fairvale to test your water. Whether she was kidding or not, I don't know.

So, it's pretty bad when you have to look at that tap and you can't turn it on. I wouldn't turn it on for a million dollars cause I'm right in back of where all the trouble is. It might be 300 years away but it don't take long for it to come down through the rocks, that is heading the right way. So tonight I don't feel too safe in Fairvale as far as drinking or anything like that. I have to carry my water.

But I could show you a book here of that dump out there you wouldn't sleep tonight if you looked at it. It's just a human disgrace. I don't mind the dump there, don't get me wrong but Mr. Lutes knows, he can sit there and smile or do whatever he likes, that place is not being cared for properly. You said you were going to bury everything. There's mountains of it never seen to be buried yet. And the place is polluted there's no sense talking, I know another gentleman hauled all that ethylene whatever you call it to the dump, he was a garbage man, he's sitting right there. He hauled all the stuff from the dry cleaning for years. Is that not right, Mr. Boyle? So we know what's out there so there's no lie about it.

So if you ever looked at this I wouldn't want you to see it, you wouldn't sleep tonight. Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Could we have a look at your book?

JORDAN:

Oh definitely. All the contradictions are in here too from the government.

LAPIERRE:

I'll just glance through it. There was a lady in the back and there's also a gentleman in the back, so I'll ask the lady if you'll...

MITCHELL:

Good evening, I'm Shirley Mitchell and I reside at Cape Spencer, Saint John. Now perhaps some of you may know and may not know there's a gold mine right in my backyard. That might seem quite great to some people but to us it has given us a lot of heart ache and worry. Just little bit of a format on it, I'll fill you in. This man operating under Gordex Minerals has been able to come in over our friend's property, now they don't live there, they've been life-long friends, he has come in and with this new Mining Act without their permission has brought in bulldozers, heavy equipment and completely torn this man's land apart.

Now with the environmental part of it. He is ready this spring to open operations. The operations consist of spraying with cyanide acid spray. First I thought it might have been just a little drip down through the pile of ore and so on, but I saw a preliminary spray take place this fall with water.

Now this spray is very high above the ground and there's no wind velocity down there that would be suitable to allow this operation to take place. Now there are two holding ponds, from what I understand, the cyanide acid will go into one, the gold will be refined or go into this and be recycled from one pond to the other and recycled again. Should a seepage take place at this time this cyanide acid could go out into our bay. Now the local fishermen are very concerned at this point here.

Number two also we have a large waste disposal that will be left. I understand it take tons of ore to refine just one ounce of gold. Can you imagine the massive waste material that will be left there on this land? He has made a statement, not to me but to someone else, that he is planning on leaving it. And knowing the man, I think he is quite capable of it.

We feel we are in the dark, we are very close to this, it's in my backyard. We, like the people of Fairvale, are very worried about our wells, what about our gardens? But what about our breathing? I mean the wind, the north wind there carries so great that there is nothing to stop a spray of cyanide acid.

I don't care what Environment Canada says, I have approached them and they are going to come down, they tell me, and they are going to put up glasses and go back and check the wind velocity and find out just how far it will carry. But it will never be safe for such an operation. And I've already heard here tonight that the Department of the Environment seems to be so overtaxed with work and can't cope with so much going on, why do they allow all this to happen in the first place. Now, did this man present this format to the government and they just OK it without coming down or checking to see how close the residents are to this big operation?

And I've heard here tonight also that Crown lands could be used for disposal. Our property butts against such Crown land. Now there's a lot of Crown land in our area. Why was this man not made to use it? The gold ore itself is being dug from Crown land. All the disposer unit has been erected on our friend's property. Now he could have used another area around Crown land which would be away from the residents and used it there, but because of the expense and which was less for him, he decided this way. But if he couldn't afford to do it, then why was he allowed to do it?

There's so many questions for us to have answered down there. And I think it's a very serious situation and I don't think the New Brunswick government should ever allowed this to happen and should correct this before it starts up this coming spring.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot. I wonder if Mr. Lutes could comment. The question might be more adequately addressed to someone from the Department of Natural Resources but there must have been an impact study done on this project?

LUTES:

I'm sorry I don't know about the project. That sort of thing would be handled by our Industrial Waste Section. There is some cross over between the Section that I'm responsible for and Industrial Waste where you have hazardous chemicals involved. We have a chap by the name of Vaclav Kresta who looks after all our mining operations and Simone tells me he's aware of this, I'm certainly not, it's out of my....

LAPIERRE:

I would if we could have this gentleman present at the next meeting so we could have the answers to these questions?

LUTES:

Sure, I don't see why not.

LAPIERRE:

I know it won't be in Saint John but at least the press can report it. So you have no specific answers to this lady's concerns?

LUTES:

No, I'm sorry, we have mining regulations and again this sort of thing is administered by our Industrial Waste Section which looks after pulp mills, ore refineries, chemical plants, mining operations, that sort of thing.

LAPIERRE:

But this is a very special mining process which she is talking about, it's something, this gas is quite deadly that's produced with this process.

LUTES:

I'm not familiar with...she mentioned cyanide acid...

LANGMAID:

Could we have a member from the Mines Branch at the next meeting to give us an idea? Can they go on land they don't have a mining license on and use it for disposal? I know they can go on if they have it staked and they have a mining claim in it, they can go on anybody's land as long as they pay damages. But this I gather is not mining on that, he's just disposing on it. This may be a different matter.

LUTES:

We could arrange to have someone from....

LAPIERRE:

OK, well I guess I'm sorry we don't have any specific answers for you Madame but we will try. There are a few people who have raised their hands. There's a lady in the back, and then there's a gentleman in the back and I'll get back to the lady out in front here. And then there's a gentleman in the front and then there's Mr. Murphy, I haven't forgotten but you already had a turn. Yes, please identify yourself.

TIPPETT:

Hello, my name is Dr. Paula Tippet and I'd like to make a short presentation. I'd like to express my support for the resolutions on toxic chemicals and hazardous waste that were passed by the New Brunswick Medical Society and the Canadian Medical Association and I'd like to make some comments on my own as well.

The Canadian Medical Association has made recommendations on control of hazardous chemicals and in 1982 the general Council passed the following resolutions:

- First that the Provincial Divisions of the Canadian Medical Association recommend to their respective Legislatures that they enact appropriate regulations for the management of hazardous waste in coordination with the other Provinces and the federal government.
- That the appropriate departments of both federal and provincial governments move to reduce further accumulations of hazardous waste by:

a. implementing policies that will result in the development of technologies that are not so dependent on potentially hazardous chemicals.

b. developing policies that will require chemical manufacturers and users to be responsible for the ultimate disposal of all chemicals and will prohibit the manufacture or sale of potentially hazardous chemicals that cannot be recycled or disposed of harmlessly and

c. founding centers of training that will further the science and practice of effective management of hazardous waste.

At our Annual Meeting in 1985 the member of the New Brunswick Medical Society expressed concern about the management of toxic chemicals in New Brunswick in view of the incidence of chemical contamination of drinking water around the Province and asked the provincial government to enforce existing regulations and enact appropriate further regulations in order to protect the public.

Some of us here in Saint John are concerned about some items in Saint John itself. The first is the diminishing protection of the watershed of the Loch Lomond Lakes which is the water supply for the east side of the city, and the Spruce Lake dump as well on the west side of the city. Some of us also have concerns about the dangerous radioactive substances at the Point Lepreau nuclear power plant and the attitude of the Power Commission toward the present leak of radioactive material from the plant. We would like the leak stopped. We'd like an adequate emergency plan in case of a serious accident at Point Lepreau and we'd like more emphasis on research to find a safe, permanent disposal method for nuclear waste with emphasis on safe, temporary storage until a safe, permanent disposal method is found.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. There are a few other people, yes sir? And then the lady in front here.

WILSON:

My name is Bill Wilson and I'm with Atlantic Analytical Services in the city. Just some comments I'd like to make à propos of what's already been said. Mr. Little, I applaud his suggestion that there should be established an incinerator in the area. I think from the point of view of a chemist and I guess engineers may agree with me, that it does represent a significant business opportunity to entrepreneurs in the region and one which I think could well be taken advantage of instead of sending our wastes to Quebec.

Secondly, in regard to the treatment of photographic chemicals, we, ourselves, do refine silver residues that are collected from photographic wastes and this we turn into products which are marketed out of Province. In the photographic process, the recovery systems tend to recycle the developing chemicals and such that are used although there is a certain carry out in the film washing and it is very desirable to maximize the use of these chemicals. For that reason he tries to remove the silver and recycle the silver-free solution. It is that recovered silver that we now turn into useful products.

Lastly, in regard to the Gordex operation, I have seen this and first of all, the cyanide is a solution of cyanide of about a pH of 10 which is quite strongly alkaline. It's not an acidic solution. The effluent from the leach piles after recovery of the gold of course, is recirculated as has been said. There is a certain excess of liquid as I understand. That is treated with chlorine or hyperchloride and is rendered non-toxic and quite safe. This is standard treatment of cyanide wastes which is commonly practiced in the electroplating field.

The question of carry over of vapour, or spray from the top of the pile out into the local residential area, of course, I cannot comment on. I think that you're quite correct in that you should have the Department of the Environment monitor just to set your mind at rest that there is no particular hazard. I don't believe within a reasonable distance of the plant that there would be a hazard from that cause. But that's my view as a chemist. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

There was a question from a panel member to a previous speaker. Do you wish to address that Ken now?

LANGMAID:

Yes. On the list of hazardous waste from health care institutes there's one here of 18 metric tonnes, I gather, of pathological waste. Now what is meant by pathological wastes? Dr. Tippitts might know or somebody else.

SIMON:

Where's that at sir?

LAPIERRE:

(tape inaudible) in which wastes were collated throughout the Province. And one of them is pathological wastes.

SIMON:

We're trying to find it in this 1985 Status Report. I don't know what you're referring to ah...

LANGMAID:

Page 12.

LAPIERRE:

Page 12, Appendix A, it's the second item on Health Care Institutions and it's the first, the last item on the list of health care, pathological wastes.

SIMON:

Yes, I see it here. I was trying to find out what we could extract from the waste products from the health care institutions. The pathological wastes that would be involved in there would be the body fluids that for instance from nasal suction, there would be old dressings that were on infective material, they would be anything out of microbiology labs where they do cultures of large varieties of things. There would be nothing there that would be of a human body part or anything like that.

The hospital also has an incinerator, the main hospital here, has an incinerator which most of the pathological specimens if there are sections or something that have to be destroyed, they would be incinerated, but most of the, well virtually everything, generally speaking goes with the chemical side. Most of the chemicals that are involved with the preservation of and fixing of certain slides and things like that, these are basically the most toxic things that we have to deal with are the various chemicals from X rays, from some of the nuclear cobalts, x ray machines, things like that that are used in the treatment of cancer. And these things have very very tight regulations on them. They would not be included under this type of thing, pathological waste.

LAPIERRE:

Just one question while you're here. I don't know if you can answer it but I agree with radioactive waste, but what happens to a scintillation fluid for example and chemicals of that sort. Do we have a process for the chemicals?

SIMON:

I'm sorry, what happens to what?

LAPIERRE:

Scintillation fluid, do you have a scintillation fluid build up at the hospital or chemical testing fluid...

SIMON:

Circulation fluid?

LAPIERRE:

Scintillation. It says laboratory chemicals 1,460 kilograms here.

SIMON:

I'm sorry I can't...what is ah....

LAPIERRE:

Well, I just wanted to know, you say the pathology waste is taken care of and the ah....

SIMON:

Some of it is recycled.

LAPIERRE:

Some of it's recycled?

SIMON:

Yes.

LAPIERRE:

Now the chemicals that you use in the hospital, what happens to those?

SIMON:

Well some of that is recycled or it's shipped out to specific plants that do the recycling on their own.

LAPIERRE:

So you have a program in which chemicals are

SIMON:

Yes, we have to fall under very very strict regulations. I don't know what is...is this for the entire Province is it?

LAPIERRE:

Yes it would be for the entire Province I guess.

SIMON:

For the entire Province yes. I'm not, I've never seen these figures before, I don't know. All I can advise on in terms of the regulations, both federal, Atomic Energy Commission, provincial, city and so on that we have to comply with for the disposal of any type of chemicals or the pathological waste or anything like that.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Miss? There's a lady first and I'll come back to the other two.

LEBLANC:

My name is Betty Leblanc.

LAPIERRE:

Could you speak to the mike please, although it may not be on.

LEBLANC:

My name is Betty Leblanc and I'm from French Village. First of all I'd like to say that Mr. Little and Mr. Murphy had a lot of good things to say. If they can all be implemented it would be a good thing.

Now my problem is the French Village Dump. There has been hazardous waste and industrial waste deposited in that dump for a number of years. I've been waiting for the report on the study now for two years. The Department of the Environment has been telling me over and over that the report would be in March and then June and then February, so, but they still haven't come up with that report and I doubt that we'll get it any way soon.

But anyway, another thing I would like to add is, I have a letter from the Minister of the Environment stating that they are implementing regional landfill, regional sanitary landfills and this is to direct the regional and commercial waste into these landfills. What I would like to know is when the Solid Waste Commissions will be set up for these regional landfills. Now according to the Honorable Robert Jackson, he said it's going to be a number of years. Well, we can't afford to wait a number of years. We have a problem now.

I mean there's been chemicals deposited in this dump. The landfill is not being properly handled. From what they say, he's not getting enough money to do this properly. Well, all I can say about that is if he's not getting enough money, then someone else should be doing it. He shouldn't be doing it if he's not receiving enough money. But what I would like to know is when will these Commissions be set up? Who will be on the Commissions? Where would these regional landfills for our area, the Saint John area, be at? And also in the letter it states that unfortunately the practice in this Province has been to minimize the funds dedicated to the operation of waste disposal facilities. And French Village is no exception. Why are the funds minimized?

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. I guess Mr. Lutes, if you care to answer first of all the regional Commissions there will be a number of regional Commissions set up and I guess Mr. Lutes could give us the approximate numbers. As far as the funding, I understand they're going to be self sufficient. So it's going to be a user-pay concept. Mr. Lutes.

LUTES:

Just to follow up first of all on Mrs. Leblanc's first question or observation, I guess I'm getting a little annoyed about this business about the abandoned site study. We embarked on this, I might just back up a bit, this was a joint federal-provincial study that was initiated by most of the Provinces in Canada. It was a four-phase study and certain of the Provinces are starting phase one, some are in phase two. I would point out that New Brunswick is the only Province in Canada that is in phase three. The initiative was taken by the Province to get on with this study, it was a very expensive thing and we wanted to know what was coming from abandoned landfill sites. Again, I will restate what I said earlier on that the problem with the holdup was the fact that we were, we had a problem with drilling. We're getting into contaminated hydrogeology here. We're getting into very sophisticated drilling techniques and very sophisticated sampling techniques with Teflon samplers to make sure that you get an uncontaminated leachate sample. The samples are checked for priority pollutants. The analysis are running about a thousand to \$1,200 apiece. We are the only Province in Canada who have gotten to this stage and we want to make sure that we do it properly.

We're spending a lot of taxpayers dollars and it's going to be done properly and the report is not available to us, we have some of the preliminary data but we are not going to release the data until we have the final report. It was agreed that that would be a four season type study and had we not had the problems with the drill water we would have, obviously it would have been a lot easier for us to sample that drill water. It would have showed no contamination and we'd be off the hook so to speak. But that certainly was not our intention.

With regard to the Commissions. We have six or eight months ago initiated Commissions, the city of Fredericton and surrounding area being the first. We have four others on the go. Shippagan/Lamèque is looking at an incinerator to serve the Shippagan/Lamèque area. The town of Sussex and surrounding area is in the Committee stage. The Committee stage precedes the Commission stage, the actual forming of the Commission. Dalhousie is in a similar position as Sussex is and Nepisiquit/Chaleur is the site selection study has been completed and we're about to embark on the Environmental Impact Assessment. So we have five of them on the go right now. We are projecting somewhere between 13 and 15 for the entire Province.

The Commissions, Mr. Chairman has pointed out, will be self-sufficient, will be user pay. The local service districts have to be members of the Commission, the municipalities within a Commission zone have the option of opting in or out. We are looking at rural collection services so that we eliminate the situation that we have now of 250 dumps around the Province and we're looking at reducing them down to about a hundred properly-operated sites. It would be phasing out a lot of the rural sites that cannot be operated properly. The revenues will be...the Commission will be operated as a legal entity. It's a child of the New Brunswick Legislature. Commissioners are people selected from the community. The concept here is to turn the responsibility back to the people. The waste belongs to the people, it's generated by the people and I guess we're saying that the people should look after disposal of that waste. The day is gone when the Province can go in and just say we're going to have a site here, we're going to have a site there, this is the way it's going to be operated. It doesn't work that way anymore because no matter where we go, we're going (tape inaudible)

(tape inaudible)....in that area there's three or four municipalities and there's probably 10 or 12 local service districts. When we start the committee each local service district and municipality is asked to send a member to a committee meeting so you normally end up, the first meeting, with about 25 or 30 members. From that it degenerates into, degenerates is not a good word I guess but, we form sort of a working group or committee. When we select a site or select a number of sites, certain members of that working committee are asked to form or to act as members of the Commission and at that point in time an Order in Council is passed naming those people. The Commission is normally made up of between three and 11 people and the Municipalities Act, the Clean Environment Act have recently been amended to allow those authorities to proceed for these Commissions to be set up and act essentially as companies.

LAPIERRE:

And they will be responsible for siting landfill sites, and will these siting require impact assessments, for example, Environmental Impact Assessment hearings?

LUTES:

That's right. The Commission, the committee goes up to the site selections phase, or step. When the site is selected a Commission is formed and as part of this process an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required on all Commission sites.

LAPIERRE:

Would these Commissions be legally responsible for polluting later on down the road as the corporate entities?

LUTES:

Yes they are.

LAPIERRE:

Madam, you have another question. Could you use the mike please, there's one right there by your chair.

LEBLANC:

Specifically for the Saint John area, when will this be adopted?

LUTES:

We have had some discussions with the officials from the city of Saint John, looking at various options and that we've had a number of requests from other municipalities as well. So, we're trying to fit the municipalities in as the resources and manpower, essentially, are available but I would think the city of Saint John is fairly high on the priority list.

LEBLANC:

Well given that Saint John only has a few years left and the problems that we do have at French Village, shouldn't that be a priority that these Commissions be set up immediately.

LUTES:

I guess every area feels that their priority is number one. The city of Edmundston will argue with you that the city of Edmundston has a higher priority than the city of Saint John. The town of Sussex feel that their priority is number one. The fact of the matter is these Commissions are very expensive to establish, they are very expensive to man. There are certain limitations, quite honestly, on the provincial budget right now in terms of funding the site selection studies and the Environmental Impact Assessments. They normally run \$100,000--\$125,000 apiece. So, by the time that you have the site selected and the E.I.A. done, you're talking a quarter of a million dollars normally.

LEBLANC:

That's still not near as expensive as the lives of people. People that have to live around landfills, that have been polluted with chemicals, toxic chemicals.

LAPIERRE:

I guess we have the answers, not the answers, it'll be sometime but I guess the specific dates we don't have. You can come back with another question after if you wish. There are two other people who asked. There's a lady in the back and there's also a gentleman. The lady please...madam do you wish to use the...

BEDELL:

I'm Kay Bedell from Hatfield Point. There are a couple of questions that have bothered me for years and I think this might be an opportunity to mention them.

What consultation has done between the Department of National Defence and our provincial government regarding waste disposal in military areas?

And the other question...what monitoring is done in waterways from Base Gagetown where we know extensive spraying is carried out and explosives are used?

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. I would turn the questions over to members of the Department. Either Madame Godin or Mr. Lutes. The first one is what goes on for siting and monitoring waste disposal on DND property? What provincial involvement? And the second one is the monitorings of waterways that run from these areas?

LUTES:

I guess the answer to both questions would be the same. All activities of federal facilities are monitored by the federal Department of the Environment. As you may know with the clean-up of Camp Gagetown pesticide containers a year or so ago, the federal government embarked on a fairly extensive monitoring program, groundwater monitoring program to see whether, to determine whether any of the chemicals had leached or had been discharged off site. But, the Province, this is the jurisdiction of the federal government, essentially, the Province does not get involved in their activities.

LAPIERRE:

You don't see the reports, or require the reports?

LUTES:

They would normally send us the reports as a matter of routine. The Renous maybe is a good situation, they presented that information to us and talked to us about it but it's basically their responsibility and they take their direction as they see fit.

BEDELL:

I'm thinking of how it affects New Brunswick and I would like to feel that this is being done on quite a regular basis. When they were digging up within the past year or so, I think that was under pressure from a group, the Sprayers of Dioxin and I'm just wondering is this a regular practice for them to check? And I think it must be a concern of New Brunswickers because it's affecting our atmosphere and our waterways.

LAPIERRE:

So Madame, if I understand correctly what you would wish would be to have a regular monitoring of the waste disposal within National Defence areas.

BEDELL:

Yes.

LAPIERRE:

How they are carried out? What is the waste?

BEDELL:

What is happening with disposal of waste within the camp grounds because they will indirectly, certainly, affect New Brunswick.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Madame. We'll try to get these answers and I'm sure as we go along through the Province and maybe we can get some answers from the Department of National Defence. There is another gentleman, please?

QUON:

My name is Ray Quon and I work at Point Lepreau. I'm working at the chem lab there. First question, well just a comment on domestic waste. I believe the legislators missed an opportunity to cut down on waste of aluminum cans and or beer bottles. It was my impression when the aluminum cans first came into the Province that they were going to be recycled and when they didn't I was rather disappointed.

I was also very surprised that they allowed the beer companies to start using all these weird sizes of beer bottles and increasing the amount of waste and also increasing the cost of the product. It was maybe something that the consumers, the consumer branch could have looked after but you know, we have them now and I guess it's a fact of life.

With respect to the liquid scint you referred to earlier. We have liquid scint waste at Lepreau as well and we're sending three drums of it off to Thorold, Ontario this coming Wednesday and it's being shipped under the Transport of Dangerous Goods Act. What else is there?

In my work at Lepreau I've been working on a dangerous list of non-radioactive materials and in our chem lab we have close to 300 types of chemicals and I'd say half of them, I've gone through the manufacturers safety data sheets and I've been compiling these lists and when it comes to disposal quite often the material safety data sheet just says refer to local government regulations. I'd like to find the proper government contacts so that I could find out what the proper government regulations for these disposal methods are. That's all I have to offer at this time.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. I guess we would, maybe we have other comments I'm sure but we've been sitting for two hours and maybe we could take a short break and there's coffee and donuts available. You don't have to leave, we'll stay here all night if we have to. But if you have any further questions or comments we'll convene in another 15 minutes or so.

COFFEE BREAK

LAPIERRE:

We have one more formal presentation and yes if you want to use mike number six that's fine.

LAKE:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the panel, I join with others who complement this presentation, this opportunity to express concerns from many of the persons who are here on behalf of members of the citizenship of Saint John. And I really feel that it has been advertised that we have been brainwashed to expect to be almost brought to these places, driven here almost before you'll have a crowd. I do not believe that the representation here does constitute a fair reflection of the interest in this particular subject.

However, one of the things that I feel is that an alarm has been set in Canada, in New Brunswick as well as the other Provinces that something must be done with hazardous waste and all waste and it seems to me that all waste is growing at an alarming rate. Features that are bringing health measures into question, such as the coffee we drink but also the aluminum cans as already mentioned by a previous speaker. All of these things. Plastics and so on.

My recommendation to the panel is there be an approach to the Education Department to first of all set up scholarships with reference to harmonizing natural resources with an understanding and also development of carefully treating wastes, hazardous waste and all other things. And also that it be taken into the classrooms where people will be informed because information is power. And I believe when the Canadian public is advised as to what the consequences are and what the nature of this subject is that we'll all want to take some active and intelligent response. Waste is a problem and it's growing. We've seen the alarm go up and therefore I believe it's a moral issue. I believe it's the responsibility of all citizens and since the government is the handmaid of the people, the servant of the people therefore, it should have priority.

Now we had a small task force in the Canadian Legion here in Saint John and our program was with reference to the environment. And our motto was "A clean city helps to make a healthy Canada". And under this motto we had these several objectives. First of all training our children in the schools and we went to the schools with the program of learning to pick up rather than to throw away. Pick up what you see, children around the schools, around throughout their whole district picking up and bringing the garbage either to school or to their own homes and putting it into receptacles.

And they helped to clean up the yard. Now this was not done just for a particular task but as a learning project. So that the children would learn to have respect and also share responsibility.

The second point was to not only pick up to sweep up. Endeavouring to gather up and the community broom whether it's a truck that the Legion have and they would go along a street and clean up or however throughout the community. And this has to do with industry. It has to do with business. It has to do with the home. It also has to do with the school.

And I would suggest that not only should a challenge go out but also the learning information that we have as to how best to do these features. Technical information going out in a form that even children can understand. How they can help. And I believe that if people know what the problem is and how to do something about it, a great measure of our people will want to get in there as a team.

And finally, beautify. Our third program was to beautify the community. Planting flowers, planting a tree. Yes replacing a tree that's ready to go out. Because you see in nature too there are features that become waste. We'll help nature to get rid of the waste by cutting down limbs that need to be removed and caring for what we have and also adding a feature of beautification. Now I would recommend that something of this nature go to the schools and get them involved so that not only the children themselves but their parents and the community will become involved in something that will answer the challenge of the alarm with something that will match nature's reproduction and also nature's clean-up. Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Following this presentation, if Mr. Little? I understand that you're a high school teacher? I wonder if you might tell us what happens to chemicals that's used in high school labs and how are students trained in taking care of chemicals? Because if we want to have an ecological or a sensitive conscience towards waste I think it needs to start in school just as the present speaker gave us. Could you give us some idea what happens in your school?

LITTLE:

I must confess I'm not too well acquainted with what goes on in the science labs being an English teacher. I don't know, we have an Environmental Studies program in school as one of our courses where I know that the kids study things like conservation, energy conservation and all the aspects of the environment and I suppose waste disposal will be one of those. I would hope that in every classroom good ecological practices are taught. If it's simply a concern about the world that we're living in and I would hope that's going on in all classrooms.

Institutionalizing another program for the high schools, something else to teach as a course, when we're having a hard job getting facilities to teach what we have at the moment, that might not be the best way. I think there are other programs which already exist to encourage children to have a conscience about the world that they are living in including their environment and their ecology.

LAPIERRE:

Are there any other school teachers in the audience, anyone who would have any idea of what happens to chemicals in high schools? It would be nice to know.

BEDELL:

Jim Bedell from Hatfield Point. I'm no longer an active science teacher for the last ten or more years but when I was teaching physics and chemistry the practice was to run it down the sink.

LAPIERRE:

I don't think it's changed much.

BEDELL:

I don't think there has been much change and I don't think that we even as a rule practiced any recovery of things like silver chloride. We let it go and I think that we probably and possibly even now were not conscious of the need to conserve and to recycle. I believe of course in the University labs a great deal more of that is done but they have the equipment and the personnel to look after it.

However, just in regard to the general question of environmental education in the schools again I'm out of touch with what is being done now. And I quite understand how the teaching profession is rather reluctant to take on further responsibilities in view of the way that they are now overloaded and there are many things very important and very desirable to incorporate into the curriculum that are nevertheless not feasible at the present because of the restraint on the facilities but we have to recognize that the need for environmental education is not confined to pupils in school, that there is a vast job of environmental education to be done with its aims at the general public in all sections of the Province, all sections of the population.

It's for this reason that those of us in the Conservation Council are attempting to treat various aspects of our environmental problems in conferences and publications and participation in events like this where we are able to bring a certain amount of the expertise of our members who really cover a wide range of professional competence to bear on these various problems and to suggest ways of handling them. For example, it may not be generally known that we published in 1985 a rather comprehensive treatment of the problem of waste disposal in New Brunswick under the name of the "Dump Dilemma". Some people in the room no doubt have seen it but that is the sort of thing that I think has to be done and has to be distributed widely. We are attempting to fulfill that role as far as our resources permit and I hope that people here who are interested in environmental protection and enhancement will take a look at the opportunities that are offered them through the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Yes Simone.

GODIN:

If I could address the matter of handling of chemicals in schools. About five years ago the Department of Environment responded to a national concern about picric acid in schools and hospitals and immediately embarked on a Province-wide collection of picric acid which was a chemical that was commonly found in schools and in hospital labs and which became explosive when dry and it was, had been linked with serious accidents in labs in Ontario. That was just the start of our involvement with school chemicals.

Since then we are on an on-going basis responding to demands from schools to pick up chemicals which are sorted out by the Department of the Environment staff as to the hazard of the chemical and those chemicals which cannot be reacted and rendered inert are shipped out of the Province for appropriate disposal in specialized licensed hazardous waste handling facilities.

LAPIERRE:

Are we to understand that all schools now dispose of chemicals through the Department of Environment?

GODIN:

I wish I could say that but I'm not in all schools at all times. What I can say is that I have been in touch with the science program directors both on the French and English level in Fredericton and they are aware of the service that we offer to schools and that we respond to the demands. We cannot always respond as quickly as some of the demands come in. We often get the type of demand where people are cleaning up school labs that have not been cleaned up in the last 20 years and they expect us to go and pack it right away and we refuse to do that. I won't let my staff do it because of the some of the dangers in transportation. I insist that I get a written list of chemicals with a description of the shape of the chemical. Then I go through my books in the office where it's safe and when I know what it is that we're handling then we send somebody out to pick it up, package it properly for transportation and ship it out.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Yes Mr. Little?

LITTLE:

If you'd like to call me tomorrow at 635-4659 I'm going to find out what our school does with our chemicals and I'll be able to tell you tomorrow.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Are there any other...yes sir?

MACLEAN:

My name is Bill MacLean. I'm from Grand Bay and I have a question that perhaps you could account for. What I'm worried about is there's been some consideration with putting an incinerator here in the local area. To that I have a question as to why we've been directed to cease burning any garbage in our dumps when we're considering putting in incinerators?

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Lutes?

LUTES:

Recently we have contacted a number of municipalities to get them to stop burning garbage because essentially burning garbage in a dump is an uncontrolled situation where you have absolutely no control on the emissions. There's a nuisance factor associated with it. That type of activity cannot be compared to a properly-controlled incinerator, that would be designed for hazardous waste, for burning chemicals for instance. They are quite dissimilar.

The idea of an incinerator for hazardous waste in the Province has been kicked around and I think we may have indicated that the likelihood of the Province having such a facility is probably quite low based on the volume of waste that we have. Knowing what facilities are available in other parts of Canada and knowing the capital costs of those facilities, and a number of those facilities are under capacity now and I think there's sort of a mutual thing that we would support their facilities and they, in turn would take our waste. We just don't think we have the volume of waste to warrant an incinerator. I think there's a bit of a misconception about incinerators not only for hazardous waste but also for municipal waste.

But again getting back to the gentleman's question, we have a lot of complaints in the Province with smoke coming from landfill sites. We in the past month have issued 60 certificates of approval or licences to those sites. I might say that the response from the municipalities has not been very encouraging. This gets into the dollars. I'd like to maybe stick a word in here about ah...everybody is in favor of good solid waste management but it seems at times I guess from our perspective nobody really wants to pay for it.

A number of the responses that we've gotten...one municipal council was going to resign if they had to implement our conditions, others have made representations to our Minister, there have been delegations to our Minister.

Just as a matter of interest, we've looked at 28 municipalities in the Province that are running what we call dumps. The cost of running those dumps to the municipality is on average \$2.18 per capita. If you figure 3.5 persons for an average household that's what 10 bucks a year. The problem is if you raise that to 15 or 20 bucks a year you have councils that want to resign, the people are going to run around and do all kinds of crazy things. The thing that we have to remember here is this is not motherhood. There's dollars associated with it and I think the general public are going to have to come to grips with that.

The technical solutions are there, they've been there for years. Our problem right now is in the imposition of those regulations and requirements and what not. There's a certain dollar figure attached to them and basically with the approach on Solid Waste Commissions we have taken the approach that they are going to cost money. We've made in law that the local service districts have to belong and basically that's the long and the short of it. There's just no easy way around this thing.

MACLEAN:

I feel that money is certainly the case, certainly in Grand Bay. The thing that comes to mind when I think about burning is which is of more importance to us, the burning or the burying of the garbage and the possibility of contamination of our water table.

LUTES:

Both items, obviously, are of consideration and of concern. I guess what we're attempting to do is, it's not only, I guess impose an environmental condition, it's one way or the other to get people thinking about the costs associated with proper landfilling operations. We cannot impose rules and regulations, conditions, guidelines, requirements on people unless the municipalities and the municipal councils are prepared to accept the fact that there is a cost associated with that. Normally what happens I'm not sure of the numbers for Grand Bay but we would approach them and tell them that they've got to convert their burning operation, their burning dump to a sanitary landfill, not to a sanitary landfill but basically to start covering their wastes.

And automatically overnight that increases the cost of the landfill by a factor of three, four or five. That assists us or makes it easier for us when we come to that particular area in the future to establish a Commission site.

If a municipality is charging its people two bucks per capita for garbage disposal which is improper, we come to the community a year from now and we say we want to set up a Commission in your area the response we're getting from the municipalities is well, it's going to cost ten bucks per capita, we're not interested. We've got a site now, it's not that bad, it burns all the time and there's leachate and there's rats and bears but it really isn't all that bad. It's bad but it's not that bad that we want to spend ten bucks.

I don't mean to be cynical because that is the response we're getting and the bottom line here is dollars and don't let anybody kid you otherwise and if we get municipalities thinking, and this is kind of a two-pronged approach, to get them thinking....we've had municipalities who have increased their budgets quite dramatically and in most of those cases where we have municipalities in Commission zones almost without exception they've opted to join a Commission. We will tell the municipality you have the choice of either joining a Commission or going it alone but if you go it alone it's going to be a sanitary landfill. And most of them realize the economics, the economies of scale are not there particularly for a small municipality to operate their own facility and do it properly.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you Mr. Lutes. Dave?

KERR:

I have a question for the media. There are a lot of media people here. The last few years you people have fanned the flames of public opinion and in all parts of the media on hazardous wastes, toxic wastes, what we call controlled waste. Have you any comments to make at this time? Or questions of the panel? Or questions of an expert like Bob Lutes?

LAPIERRE:

No comments. There's a comment in the back there.

THOMPSON:

Yes Dave Thompson with the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. I'm quite interested in this discussion that's just sort of gone on and it seems to me that garbage aside from hazardous waste, the general garbage, landfill as we now consider it garbage is always going to be a problem. It seems to be increasing and very costly.

One way that we can deal with that and there hasn't really been much said about it tonight, it's been mentioned is recycling. We're putting prodigious amounts of material into these landfill sites and the cost of handling that, of trucking, of the energy costs involved are ever going to increase.

The dumps are expanding as landfill sites, well these new regional landfill sites, will be in the problem of keeping, of looking for more and nobody of course want it in their backyard. Now one way that we can reduce the amount of the material and that also we can make it a little more economic is to recycle. In the meantime creating a lot of jobs and not only creating environmental benefits in the garbage itself and jobs in the recycling but also saving a lot of our resources.

For instance if we manage to retain a few more tons of paper or cardboard we save a few thousand trees. And the same would go for such things as glass. For instance now we're in a situation where we just see the glass going into the dumps in New Brunswick where glass is being hauled from New York State by truck to the glass plant in Scoudouc. There isn't any reason that should be happening and I think it's archaic to consider regional landfills and that type of thing without recycling programs and infrastructure programs and community separation programs to go along with those things.

Now I don't want to be long-winded about this but the Conservation Council of New Brunswick sponsored a program in Saint John about two years ago where we did a municipal waste recycling study for Saint John, I have a copy of that with me tonight, which I'll give to the panel. I believe maybe one of two, or two of the panel members have already read that before. And I think if that kind of thing were looked at closely and if there were consideration given to implementing that wherever possible that the benefits would be very wide.

We would see them again in areas of employment, reduction of our resources that were being used, less land taken, reduced costs in handling the garbage and such things as that, you know, many benefits that are not easily recognizable.

Just for instance I just glanced through this report. I hadn't read it myself for some time, but I just glanced at it before I came to the meeting tonight, but it's kind of interesting I noticed that in the way of lubrication oils, for instance, when we looked at it we looked at the year 1978 and then there were some 5 million gallons sold in the Province and of that about a million were, they felt recovered through recycling, about another million of that were burned in the process of operation and the other stuff just disappeared so it must have gone down the drain, into the water table or been dumped on the ground. And, you know, we just shouldn't be continuing on in this kind of way.

I guess perhaps with the hazardous waste we could also look at things like that too should we be using it, much of it. For instance, the first thing that come to mind is probably the most widespread hazardous waste in New Brunswick and that is the pesticides and herbicides that are sprayed over the Province and if we look at the herbicides probably we can get away without using a lot of those on such things as forest land that needs to be thinned or hydro transmission lines that need to be cleared. We can do that by hand cutting and put people to work. We don't have to have those chemicals to deal with in the Province. We don't have to dispose of them. We're creating jobs right at home. And we can go on and on with a dozen other chemicals that are very hazardous in the same manner but we have to change our approach.

And again, you know, like was mentioned tonight, it goes back to education and education programs in the schools and in our own communities and I think that people can learn a lot about garbage if a few of these things are instituted such as voluntary recycling programs, for instance they had one in Kitchener, Ontario, a city about the size of Saint John where people were given bins that they could hang up or place in the areas where they formerly put their garbage near their homes and one part of the container was for glass, another one for paper and another one for metal and then when the garbage collection came around they dumped it appropriately into their truck and it was immediately ready for recycling. And these are the kind of things that should be happening.

I mean are we going to stick with the archaic ways that we have been disposing of waste in the past and the way that we've been generating it and handling it or are we going to look to those kind of alternatives? And if we don't, you know, we're going to be talking about these programs of how we might improve the situation maybe in another 20 years from now in the same way we are tonight only we'll have, you know, many more wells contaminated and many more chemicals around and many more landfill sites and it'll be harder to find somebody else's backyard.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you sir. I wonder if I could get a comment. Mr. Robichaud, I wonder if there's any thought given to recycling within the city of Saint John?

ROBICHAUD:

The position I've taken is that we'll assist anybody that would like to get involved in recycling. We'd be more than happy to accommodate them. But I think it's been proven in Fredericton that it does need some support in other words you have to pay a few extra dollars. I believe in it wholeheartedly myself and I think it should be done. Recently a firm by the name of Walsh Incorporated came down here to the city of Saint John and to the Province of New Brunswick to the Department of the Environment and they are promoting a total recycling technique. And it's interesting and they're talking about paying a total capital cost of the plant and only charging people for so many dollars per ton for deposited garbage and they would take it from there. It'll certainly be interesting to see what comes of that technology.

LAPIERRE:

This is a commercial firm?

ROBICHAUD:

Yes, they are presently putting a plant up, I guess, near Montreal and I hope to be up there in the spring and see it as soon as it is completed.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you. Mr. Lutes you have a comment?

LUTES:

Just maybe an observation or a comment on the recycling experience in the city of Fredericton. Fredericton Recycling has operated a curbside pick-up and recycling facility for the past several years. The Province has supported that financially and morally and otherwise. What we've learned, I guess, from our experience is that, at least in the city of Fredericton, it doesn't really work. We're not quite sure why but the level of participation is quite high. It normally runs 50-60%, that is 50-60% of the households in the city of Fredericton participate in the program but they don't put out any wastes to speak of.

It's running maybe three, four, five percent of the total waste generated by the population of Fredericton ends up being picked up by Fredericton Recycling and there's been a tremendous amount of promotion, both by Fredericton Recycling, by our Department, our Information Services section, as I say we've put money into it.

Fredericton Recycling is run by two University professors who are very dedicated environmentalists and I would suspect that if recycling is going to work in this Province, it would have and should have worked in the city of Fredericton. Now the operation is still going but it's just not picking up the volume of waste that maybe we'd all like to think it would.

I attended a number of the public meetings with the city of Fredericton on their seeking of a landfill site and that was the standard comment that we got from the people recycling, recycling, that's the way to go to the point that I was afraid at one point we weren't going to have enough garbage for the landfill site but nobody....a lot of people participate but it's a matter of putting out a half dozen newspapers once in a while. Unfortunately we don't have enough aluminum cans, and I think in other jurisdictions the aluminum can is essentially the engine that motors the whole recycling operation. The type of waste that we have here is worth 30-40-50 bucks a ton. If you look at the cost of pick-up, and transportation it's low volume, low value type waste and it just hasn't worked.

It's worked in Kitchener/Waterloo where they had gone in and bought special trucks and as Mr. Thompson pointed out, some special containers. They spent a half million dollars and it took. Maybe that's the approach we have here but we're essentially looking for reasons why recycling does not appear, at least at present, does not appear to work.

THOMPSON:

What we're talking about here is serious recycling programs, not programs that are separate from the collection of garbage although these things if people want to get in those to, you know, for their own purposes, or to benefit a certain group by profiting from recycling, that's good but I think what we're looking at if the garbage has got to be picked up anyway and taken to the dump why not separate it and sell it? It has to be done anyway.

LANGHAID:

You speak of Kitchener spending a half a million dollars getting this stuff ready, Fredericton spent a million dollars fooling around trying to get a dump site. If they'd have been recycling they wouldn't have had to move their dump site they'd have had lots of room down there.

LUTES:

You still need a landfill site, obviously is what....

LANGHAID:

You had one but you wouldn't use it up as fast. What about composting your wet materials?

LUTES:

That has been looked at in the city of Fredericton as well.

LANGHAID:

Has Ira gone any place in his experiment on that?

LUTES:

Ira has got a lot of compost but again you've got to have a market for it. The study is there, the information is there, the waste is there, but nobody seems to want it, there isn't a market for it.

LANGMAID:

Well in Holland, after the war, they couldn't produce enough of it. They were begging to get the chance to haul it away.

LUTES:

You'll find the European experience I think is a little different that ours where they're recycling probably 30-35% of their newsprint and have had to for years because in the Scandinavian countries and whatnot that they're, they just don't have the trees. The trees don't grow as fast, I guess and they just don't have the trees that we do.

We're still, I guess at a point where we're essentially a throw-away society and until the economics of that change maybe we're not going to see anything happening in the way of intensive recycling.

LANGMAID:

There's a case of education to get them to do it.

LUTES:

Well again, getting back to the Fredericton experience the education was quite intensive. There were displays set up in malls, the city had people hired...students going door to door, pamphlets, radio announcements, the whole thing was just blitzed and every attempt was made to communicate to the people and I guess was encouraged to see the response, the fact that 50-60% of the people participated in the program which I think is something to build on but unfortunately, as I said (tape inaudible)...could make it worth while.

LAPIERRE:

I also think Mr. Thompson has a point when he says is recycling is going to work it has to a worthwhile venture. You mustn't forget that in Fredericton you also have other individuals who are working in recycling and creaming the crop so that it doesn't get to the landfill, where the clean paper is going and I think it has to be a total commitment to recycling if it's going to work and if we put a comparable amount of money into recycling that we do in landfilling we might have something that would work. I think it needs to be looked at with a different outlook. I also find it a bit ironic that we bury bottles when Scoudouc has to import garbage bottles from New York. That seems to see somewhat of a dichotomy to me. Yes Mr. Thompson?

THOMPSON:

Yes, there's just a couple of points that I would like to make on that again. Again for it to work it has to be a serious attempt and it has to be done on a municipal basis, it can't be done in the kind of way it was done in Fredericton. We're looking at reducing the cost of disposing of garbage by doing it and we're looking at city employees doing it and other people can get in it for their own purposes and take garbage or refuse out of the system but to do it in a way that is going to reduce the amount of material going in and to do it effectively there's got to be government support for it and it's got to be done through the system.

The other point I'd like to make is that we are scarce of resources in New Brunswick just the same as the European countries are. We are scarce of forests in New Brunswick. We have too many mills. We have practices going on now where they are overcutting and scavenging whatever is possible. We do have a wood shortage situation here and if we can salvage any amount of cardboard or paper we are saving our trees.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Helen, did you have a question? There's also another question or just a comment in regard to compost and if we look at recent studies in agriculture we find that many of the soils in New Brunswick are lacking organic materials. So maybe the incorporation of the organic byproducts of waste disposal might help to enhance the soil organic content.

Yes Mr. Murphy?

MURPHY:

As a final comment, I'd like to say Mr. Chairman that I don't think that the government is sufficiently aware of the seriousness of the environmental problems. Now the reason I say that is this. Recently where we had one department looking after environmental problems, now the Department of the Environment was combined with the Department of Municipal Affairs. Now as you know, the Department of Municipal Affairs is concerned with all the problems that cities, towns and villages have throughout the entire Province. And to combine the Department of Environment with the Department of Municipal Affairs means that the Department of Environment or environmental affairs are going to be put on the back burner and will not get the same attention as it would if there was one department looking after environmental affairs entirely.

I also feel that the government wasn't sufficiently aware of environmental problems because in the budget, the various items that the government budgeted for environmental, the Department of the Environment came down number 26 out of about 25. So you can see how low down it was, the fact that it was put down so low is proof that the government wasn't aware of the seriousness of environmental problems.

In the Legislature any time that I got up to criticize the Department of Environment's budget, I never did criticize it because I have said every time, I said that the budget was too small and if it was doubled it would still be too small. So for those reasons I think that that's very very important that there should be one department to look after environmental affairs because environmental problems are increasing, not decreasing. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you.

TAYLOR:

Mr. Murphy, I wonder if I could ask you a question relating to your comments earlier in the evening. I'm Helen up here at the table. A while ago when you were up you made a statement that you thought that absolutely no hazardous waste should be kept in the Province of New Brunswick. I was wondering in your mind, is hazardous waste all that waste that cannot be safely disposed of in a domestic landfill site?

MURPHY:

Yes.

TAYLOR:

Would you consider everything?

MURPHY:

Yes, I would.

TAYLOR:

You would. And you would not consider...

MURPHY:

It should not be permanently kept within the Province. There have to be holding areas and I would think two would be sufficient and no matter where there was hazardous waste, it would be delivered to those two sites. They would be properly monitored all the time and therefore as soon as that was done and at an appropriate time, when a sufficient quantity was ready, then it should be shipped out of the Province entirely and there are two provinces; Ontario and Quebec that are willing to accept it.

TAYLOR:

I guess what concerns me is...I wonder would any other province really take all our hazardous waste. Are we not going to have to attempt to dispose of some of our own, as asbestos and this type of waste.

MURPHY:

I think anything that's hazardous should be shipped out. But the other, local problems, they should be handled like...what should happen in Saint John, for example, we take Saint John because it's a large city and I think for the surrounding area, Saint John and surrounding areas, what we should have here is incineration. And you could put in incineration, it's very expensive, but you could put that in an area like Saint John because you can sell the byproducts, such as the heat and so forth and heat large buildings. Now Prince Edward Island has the most efficient incineration that there is anywhere. And the reason that they have it is that the federal government donated \$6 million as a nest egg to start the project off. And that's why they have such an efficient incineration program on Prince Edward Island.

TAYLOR:

So you're suggesting that if you had a central incinerator capable of destroying some of the hazardous waste that you're talking about, would you think that Saint John would agree to be the central incinerator for the rest of the Province?

MURPHY:

Well, not for the...oh no, it couldn't handle it for all of the Province. It would be areas. Like Saint John would handle Saint John and the six or seven incorporated areas in the immediate vicinity and the unincorporated areas in that same vicinity. No, we couldn't handle it for the whole Province. There would be several located.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Murphy.

LANGHAID:

The Prince Edward Island one doesn't incinerate hazardous wastes though, it's domestic waste.

MURPHY:

No, hazardous waste, as I said before, should be held in bins and shipped out of the Province. No there's no incinerating that.

LANGMAID:

OK, I want to ask a question over here. I think Bob or Miss Godin could answer this one. How long do you figure we would hold hazardous waste in our holding area once the facilities in Quebec are ready to operate?

GODIN:

Once facilities in either Quebec or Ontario would be able to handle waste coming from New Brunswick holding in storage if they have the capacity to handle our wastes as we produce it, I would think would be the length of time it would take to accumulate sufficient waste to fill up a truck, either a tank truck of compatible materials that can be shipped as one waste stream or a truck that could carry 40 or 88 drums or whatever the capacity on the truck would be that carries drums of hazardous wastes. But there is one thing where we would depend on other jurisdictions to handle our waste while both Quebec and Ontario have indicated that essentially they have no problem with accepting waste that would be produced in New Brunswick.

It is understood that the waste from Quebec or Ontario would have precedence over waste from New Brunswick. So that when these facilities are in operation and the regulations are in place in Quebec and Ontario, our waste would be acceptable when the facility would be able to take the waste. That would not be in our control. Now, experience shows that hazardous waste facilities are usually built too big to handle the waste streams produced in a province. Quebec has already a hazardous waste facility to handle inorganic waste and it's running at about 15-20% capacity. They overestimated the waste when they did the market study to develop the facility and that has been proven true in America and in Europe. That when you develop a hazardous waste facility, you usually develop it much bigger than what you need because as soon as a hazardous waste facility is available the generator starts reducing the volume of waste he produces because it's too expensive to get rid of. So as far as the environment, the objective of a protected environment is achieved but for the marketing of the hazardous waste facility, it creates problems.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Helen, do you have another question?

TAYLOR:

Just while you're there please Miss Godin, a while ago a Doctor over here said that there were very strict guidelines when it came to disposing of toxic chemicals from the hospital. And yet perhaps I misunderstood. And yet you have no guidelines, even through the quantity wouldn't be nearly as much, for the schools, the laboratories in the schools.

GODIN:

There are no specific guidelines for the schools. The schools waste stream is not as large as one would expect. The quantities are fairly small and the volumes involved are small and a lot of the waste produced in schools can be utilized and handled by the chemistry teacher in the lab. The hospital, it's interesting that it has been brought up a couple of times tonight, Environment Canada is embarking on a national study of hospital pathological wastes, handling of it in various provinces. It would cover the type of waste, the packaging, the disposal, the transportation. It is all being tightened up in one package at the present time.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. There is a comment in the back, Dr?

SIMON:

Just a couple of points. One of the things in order to deal with a problem we must understand how big the problem is and I think one of the major educational aspects of your Commission or your Sub-Committee that you should address is first of all, trying to get an inventory or register of what companies are using toxic chemicals or are producing hazardous waste by-products. I think we have to understand that. I've been involved in several committees myself and once you get into it you find out really that nobody knows, and worst of all, the general public doesn't know that the soaps they could be using, the detergents they could be using, the water they are drinking. They have no idea if it is contaminated or not.

And they may not know what waste products are produced by a nearby plant or a nearby store or confectionery or whatever. So I think it must be, there has to be an education process in place so that we will readily understand what is hazardous to our health, because most of us don't understand. Some of the things that are in the sweets over there for instance have been proclaimed to be carcinogenic agents a long time ago and various types of sweeteners and things. We haven't any idea of what we're eating, what we're breathing or what we're drinking or what is just simply fallout all over us. So I think that that type of education has to be achieved first before we can really start to address your problem.

The second aspect - is we are now only in the last generation since all the hoopla associated with the defoliants that were used in Vietnam and so on we're now only starting to scratch the surface of the health problems, the long-term chronic health problems. It's very easy for someone to be sprayed with mustard gas or something and within minutes having problems. But it's another thing to ten years after an exposure, or 25 years after an exposure, or worse yet in your children having problems that occurred because you were exposed as a youngster. And those types of things. So that if we're talking cost, the long-range aspect of cost, just in the health field alone, I'm sure will far outweigh any cost that we put in on today's dollars in order to build an incinerator or to get a little better monitoring program of what we are throwing away or what we are contaminating the environment with. Because several cases of long-term chronic illness or genetic problems down the line will certainly go a long way to paying for some sort of monitoring team.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Well I guess this is one of the objectives of the Panel as we go through the Province. Hopefully, we can entice the media and so far, I think they've done a good job of alerting the public, so hopefully these meetings will be reported and the items that come up at the meetings adds one more page in educating the public. There's also the fact that, I guess, we have to educate but we also have to act. Because we have problems. And if we wait for education of another generation, it may be too late. And for some it's already too late because the wells in Fairvale, for example, they're contaminated. So we have to try to change.

Are there any other aspects or questions that someone would like to bring up?

If not then...yes?

LAKE:

This is just one point with reference to small items where we feel, well, it's just a small item here. It can't be very dangerous. We know how dangerous a pill can be if it's the wrong pill. We're allergic to things and, you know, we're all exposed to what is going on with our neighbour, etc. So I'm just suggesting that we can't be so cavalier to say, well it's just a little problem or it's just a little item. Seems to me that careful study and also action, careful action, such as doctors realize because they are handling so many different things. And I must tip my hat to many of the Doctors who are very cautious about what they hand out but I think to some extent we all have to be informed, but we also have to act for the best. Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

I guess on those wise words we'll end tonight's hearing and I'd like to take this opportunity to thank each and every one of you for your comments.

CORBETT:

I invite everyone here to pick up a copy of this document. It's called the Hazardous Waste in New Brunswick, 1985 Status Report and it outlines the hazardous waste management strategy that the New Brunswick government proposes and we invite you to read it and let Council know what your comments are on this so that they can make their recommendations with your input. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you once more and have a safe trip home.